05-17-03 4!

GAU 1516

446.022

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

G. Leffers

DIU-HERCEND et al

Serial No.: 09/674,109

Commissioner for Patents

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

P.O. Box 1450

Group: 1636

Filed: June 21, 2001

For: METHOD ...S.CERVISIAE

600 Third Avenue New York, N.Y. 10016 August 26, 2003

**RESPONSE** 

"Express Mail" mailing label 10. 200
Date of Deposit
I hereby cortibe in the service of the service in the service in the service in the service above and is accounted to the Communicated above and

Sir:

Responsive to the office action of August 11, 2003, Applicants request reconsideration of the application.

AUG 2 9 2003

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

The office action held that the response filed on May 27, 2003 was non-responsive since Applicants did not indicate an election of a particular gene product.

It is believed that the previous response was responsive to the office action of April 28, 2003 since the office action merely set out a four-way restriction requirement between four groups of claims and Applicants elected with traverse the genes of group III, namely groups 181 to 270. The inventions were allegedly grouped since they did not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1. There was no election of a single species and the Examiner merely indicated that the required reply must

include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed. However, since the Examiner apparently has changed his mind and is now requiring an election of species, Applicants elect with traverse YDR 181c.

Since the first office action which was issued more than two years after the filing of the application and was merely a restriction requirement, Applicants request a prompt examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted, Muserlian, Lucas and Mercanti

Charles A. Muserlian, 19,683
Attorney for Applicants

Tel. # (212) 661-8000

CAM:ds Enclosure